Impact of Correlation between Nakagami-m Interferers on Coverage Probability and Rate in Cellular Systems

Suman Kumar Sheetal Kalyani

Dept. of Electrical Engineering

IIT Madras

Chennai 600036, India

{ee10d040,skalyani}@ee.iitm.ac.in

arXiv:1401.4663v2 [cs.IT] 25 Jul 2014

Abstract

Coverage probability and rate expressions are theoretically compared for the following cases: (i). Both the user channel and the N interferers are independent and non identical Nakagami-m distributed random variables (RVs). (ii). The N interferers are correlated Nakagami-m RVs. It is analytically shown that the coverage probability in the presence of correlated interferers is greater than or equal to the coverage probability in the presence of non-identical independent interferers when the shape parameter of the channel between the user and its base station is not greater than one. It is further analytically shown that the average rate in the presence of correlated interferers is greater than or equal to the average rate in the presence of non-identical independent interferers. Simulation results are provided and these match with the obtained theoretical results. The utility of our results are also discussed.

Index Terms

Majorization theory, Stochastic ordering, Nakagami-m fading, Correlation, Coverage probability, Average rate.

I. Introduction

Performance degradation of wireless communication is typically caused by multipath fading and co-channel interference. Various fading models have been studied in literature for modeling

the interferers and user channels. Among them, the Nakagami-m distribution is a very popular fading model, and Rayleigh fading can be treated as a special case of Nakagami-m fading [1].

Coverage probability[1] is an important metric for performance evaluation of cellular systems and for Nakagami-m fading environment it has been studied extensively for both independent and correlated interferers case [2]–[10]. In the case where the fading parameters are arbitrary and possibly non-identical for the N Nakagami-m interferers and the fading parameter for the user channel is also arbitrary, coverage probability expression has been derived in terms of integral in [9], infinite series in [5], [6], [8] and multiple series in [10].

Typically, in practical scenario correlation exists among the interferers [11]–[14]. For example in cellular networks when two base stations (BSs) from adjacent sectors act as interferers, the interferers are correlated and it is mandated that while performing system level simulation, this correlation be explicitly introduced in the system [15]. Considering the impact of correlation in the large scale shadowing component and the small scale multipath component is also an essential step towards modeling the channel. The decorrelation distance in multipath components is lower when compared to shadowing components since shadowing is related to terrain configuration and/or large obstacles between transmitter and receiver [13].

For more general fading distributions, namely the $\eta - \mu$ fading [16] which also includes Nakagami-m fading distribution as a special case, the coverage probability has been studied for both independent and correlated interferers case [17]–[19]. In particular, Rayleigh fading for interferers channel, and $\eta - \mu$ fading for the user channel are assumed in [17]. In [18], $\eta - \mu$ fading has been considered assuming integer values of fading parameter μ for interferers channel and arbitrary fading parameter μ for the user channel. Also, $\eta - \mu$ fading with integer values of fading parameter μ for either the user channel or the interferer channel but not for both are assumed in [19].

However, to the best of our knowledge, no prior work in open literature has analytically compared the coverage probability and rate when interferers are independent with the coverage probability and rate when interferers are correlated. In this work, for Nakagami-m fading we compare the coverage probability when the interferers are independent and non identically

[1]It is a probability that a user can achieve a target Signal-to-Interference-plus-noise-Ratio (SINR) T, and outage probability is the complement of coverage probability.

distributed (i.n.i.d.) with the coverage probability when the interferers are positively correlated[2] using majorization theory. It is analytically shown that the coverage probability in presence of correlated interferers is higher than the coverage probability when the interferers are i.n.i.d., when the user channel's shape parameter is lesser than or equal to one, and the interferers have Nakagami-m fading with arbitrary parameters (i.e., shape parameter can be less than or greater than one). We also show that when the user channel's shape parameter is greater than one, one cannot say whether coverage probability is higher or lower for the correlated case when compared to the independent case, and in some cases coverage probability is higher while in other cases it is lower[3].

We further analytically compare the average rate when the interferers are i.n.i.d. with the average rate when the interferers are correlated using stochastic ordering theory. It is shown that the average rate in the presence of positively correlated interferers is higher than the average rate in the presence of i.n.i.d. interferers. Our results show that correlation among interferers is beneficial for the desired user. We briefly discuss how the desired user can exploit this correlation among the interferers to improve its rate in Section VI. We have also carried out extensive simulations for both the i.n.i.d. interferers case and the correlated interferers case and some of these results are reported in Section VI. In all the cases, the simulation results match with our theoretical results. The work done here can be easily extended to the scenario where the user's channel experience Nakagami-m fading and interfering channel experience $\eta - \mu$ fading with half integer or integer value of parameter μ.

II. System Model

We consider a homogeneous macrocell network with hexagonal structure having inter cell site distance $2R$ as shown in Fig. 1. The Signal-to-Interference-Ratio (SIR) η of a user located at r

[2]If $cov(X_i, X_j) \geq 0$ then X_i and X_j are positively correlated RVs, where $cov(X_i, X_j)$ denotes the covariance between X_i and X_j [20].

[3]The expression for outage probability given in [17]–[19] are in terms of multiple series. However, motivated by the bit error probability expression in the multiple antenna system in the presence of generalized fading model [21]–[26], we have given equivalent expressions for coverage probability in terms of Lauricella hypergeometric function, since that simplifies the analysis required for comparison between i.n.i.d. and correlated interferers case significantly.

meters from the BS is given by

$$\eta(r) = \frac{Pgr^{-\beta}}{\sum\limits_{i\in\phi} Ph_i d_i^{-\beta}}, \tag{1}$$

where ϕ denotes the set of interfering BSs and $N = |\phi|$ denotes the cardinality of the set ϕ. The transmit power of a BS is denoted by P. A standard path loss model $r^{-\beta}$ is considered, where $\beta \geq 2$ is the path loss exponent. Note that for the path loss model $r^{-\beta}$ to be valid, it is assumed that users are at least a minimum distance d meter away from the BS. An interference limited network is assumed, and hence the noise power is neglected. The distance between user to tagged BS (own BS) and the ith interfering BS is denoted by r and d_i, respectively. The user channel's power and the channel power between i^{th} interfering BS and user are gamma distributed (corresponds to Nakagami-m fading) with $g \sim \mathcal{G}(\alpha_u, \lambda_u)$ and $h_i \sim \mathcal{G}(\alpha_i, \lambda_i)$, respectively. The pdf of the gamma RV g is given by

$$f_Y(y) = \frac{y^{\alpha_u - 1} e^{-\frac{y}{\lambda_u}}}{(\lambda_u)^{\alpha_u}\Gamma(\alpha_u)},\ y \geq 0 \tag{2}$$

where, $\alpha_u \geq 0.5$ is the shape parameter, $\lambda_u > 0$ denotes the scale parameter, and $\Gamma(.)$ denotes the gamma function. The coverage probability of a user located at distance r meters from the BS is defined as

$$P_c(T, r) = P(\eta(r) > T) = P\left(\frac{gr^{-\beta}}{I} > T\right) = P\left(I < \frac{gr^{-\beta}}{T}\right) \tag{3}$$

where T denotes the target SIR, and $I = \sum\limits_{i\in\phi} h_i d_i^{-\beta}$. Since $h_i \sim \mathcal{G}(\alpha_i, \lambda_i)$, hence I is the sum of weighted i.n.i.d. gamma variates with weights $d_i^{-\beta}$. We will use the fact that weighted gamma variates $h_i' = w_i h_i$ can be written as gamma variates with weighted scale parameter i.e., $h_i' \sim \mathcal{G}(\alpha_i, \lambda_i d_i^{-\beta})$ [27]. Thus, $I = \sum\limits_{i\in\phi} h_i'$ is the sum of N i.n.i.d gamma variates. The pdf of the sum of i.n.i.d. and correlated gamma RVs has been extensively studied in [6], [21], [28]–[34] and references therein. In the context of this paper, we use the confluent Lauricella function representation of the pdf of the sum of gamma variates.

The sum, X of N i.n.i.d. gamma RVs, $h_i' \sim \mathcal{G}(\alpha_i, \lambda_i')$ where $\lambda_i' = \lambda_i d_i^{-\beta}$ has a pdf given by [21], [35], [36],

$$f_X(x) = \frac{x^{\sum\limits_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i - 1}}{\prod\limits_{i=1}^{N}(\lambda_i')^{\alpha_i}\Gamma\left(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i\right)} \phi_2^{(N)}\left(\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_N; \sum_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i; \frac{-x}{\lambda_1'}, \cdots, \frac{-x}{\lambda_N'}\right),\ x \geq 0 \tag{4}$$

where $\phi_2^{(N)}(.)$ is the confluent Lauricella function [35]–[37]. The cumulative distribution function (cdf) of X is given by

$$F_X(x) = \frac{x^{\sum_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i}}{\prod_{i=1}^{N}(\lambda_i')^{\alpha_i}\Gamma\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i+1\right)}\phi_2^{(N)}\left(\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_N;\sum_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i+1;\frac{-x}{\lambda_1'},\cdots,\frac{-x}{\lambda_N'}\right). \quad (5)$$



Fig. 1: Macrocell network with hexagonal tessellation having inter cell site distance $2R$

III. Coverage Probability

In this section, the coverage probability expression is given in terms of special functions for both the i.n.i.d. interferers case and correlated interferers case.

A. Coverage Probability in Presence of i.n.i.d. Nakagami-m Fading

The coverage probability expression can be written as $P\left(I < \frac{gr^{-\beta}}{T}\right)$. Using the fact that I is the sum of N i.n.i.d. gamma variates, one obtains,

$$P_c(T,r) = E_g\left[\frac{\left(\frac{gr^{-\beta}}{T}\right)^{\sum_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i}}{\Gamma\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i+1\right)\prod_{i=1}^{N}(\lambda_i')^{\alpha_i}}\phi_2^{(N)}\left(\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_N;\sum_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i+1;\frac{-gr^{-\beta}}{T\lambda_1'},\cdots,\frac{-gr^{-\beta}}{T\lambda_N'}\right)\right], \quad (6)$$

where E_g denotes expectation with respect to RV g which is gamma distributed. Using transformation of variables with $\frac{g}{\lambda}=t$, and the fact that $g\sim\mathcal{G}(\alpha_u,\lambda_u)$, (6) can be further simplified

as

$$P_c(T,r) = K'\lambda^{\sum_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i+\alpha_u}\int_0^\infty \frac{t^{\sum_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i+\alpha_u-1}e^{-t}}{\Gamma\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i+\alpha_u\right)}\phi_2^{(N)}\left(\alpha_1,\cdots\alpha_N;\sum_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i+1;\frac{-t\lambda r^{-\beta}}{T\lambda_1'},\cdots\frac{-t\lambda r^{-\beta}}{T\lambda_N'}\right)\mathrm{d}t. \tag{7}$$

where, $K' = \frac{1}{\lambda_u^{\alpha}}\frac{\Gamma\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i+\alpha_u\right)}{\Gamma\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i+1\right)}\frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha_u)}\prod_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_i' r^{\beta}T}\right)^{\alpha_i}$. In order to simplify (7), we use the following integral equation [36, P. 286, Eq 43]

$$F_D^{(N)}[\alpha_u,\beta_1,\cdots,\beta_N;\gamma;x_1,\cdots,x_N] = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha_u)}\int_0^\infty e^{-t}t^{\alpha_u-1}\phi_2^N[\,\beta_1,\cdots,\beta_2,\gamma;x_1t,\cdots,x_Nt]\mathrm{d}t, \tag{8}$$

$$\max\{Re(x_1),\cdots,Re(x_N)\}<1, Re(\alpha_u)>0;$$

Here $F_D^{(N)}\left[a,b_1,\cdots,b_N;c;x_1,\cdots,x_N\right]$ is the Lauricella's function of the fourth kind [38]. Using (8) to evaluate (7), one obtains

$$P_c(T,r) = \frac{\Gamma\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i+\alpha_u\right)}{\Gamma\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i+1\right)}\frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha_u)}\prod_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{\lambda}{\lambda_i' r^{\beta}T}\right)^{\alpha_i}F_D^{(N)}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i+\alpha_u,\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_N;\sum_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i+1;\tfrac{-\lambda r^{-\beta}}{T\lambda_1'},\cdots,\tfrac{-\lambda r^{-\beta}}{T\lambda_N'}\right], \tag{9}$$

$F_D^{(N)}(.)$ can be evaluated by using single integral expression [21], [38] or multiple integral expression [35]. A series expression for $F_D^{(N)}(.)$ involving N-fold infinite sums is given by

$$F_D^{(N)}[a,b_1,\cdots,b_N;c;x_1,\cdots,x_N] = \sum_{i_1\cdots i_N=0}^{\infty}\frac{(a)_{i_1+\cdots+i_N}(b_1)_{i_1}\cdots(b_N)_{i_N}}{(c)_{i_1+\cdots+i_N}}\frac{x_1^{i_1}}{i_1!}\cdots\frac{x_N^{i_N}}{i_N!}, \tag{10}$$

$$\max\{|x_1|,\cdots|x_N|\}<1,$$

where, $(a)_n$ denotes the Pochhammer symbol which is defined as $(a)_n = \frac{\Gamma(a+n)}{\Gamma(a)}$. The series expression for Lauricella's function of the fourth kind converges if $\max\{|x_1|,\cdots|x_N|\}<1$. However from (9) it is apparent that convergence condition, i.e., $\max_i|\frac{-\lambda r^{-\beta}}{T\lambda_i'}|<1$ is not always satisfied, since $r<d_i$. Hence in order to obtain a series expression for $F_D^{(N)}(.)$ which converges, we use the following property of the Lauricella's function of the fourth kind [35, p.286].

$$F_D^{(N)}[a,b_1,\cdots,b_N;c;x_1,\cdots,x_N] = \left[\prod_{i=1}^{N}(1-x_i)^{-b_i}\right]F_D^{(N)}\left(c-a,b_1,\cdots,b_N;c;\tfrac{x_1}{x_1-1},\cdots,\tfrac{x_N}{x_N-1}\right) \tag{11}$$

and rewrite (9) as

$$P_c(T,r)=\frac{\Gamma\left(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i+\alpha_u\right)}{\Gamma\left(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i+1\right)\Gamma(\alpha_u)}\prod_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{\lambda}{\lambda+\lambda_i' r^{\beta}T}\right)^{\alpha_i} F_D^{(N)}\left[1-\alpha_u,\alpha_1,\cdots,\alpha_N;\sum_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i+1;\frac{\lambda}{\lambda+r^{\beta}\lambda_1' T},\cdots,\frac{\lambda}{\lambda+r^{\beta}\lambda_N' T}\right] \tag{12}$$

B. Coverage Probability in Presence of Correlated Interferers

In this subsection, we obtain the coverage probability expression in presence of correlated interferers, when the shape parameter of all the interferers are identical. The sum, Z of N correlated not necessarily identically distributed gamma RVs $Y_i \sim \mathcal{G}(\alpha_c,\lambda_i')$ has a cumulative distribution function given by [31], [32],

$$F_Z(z)=\frac{z^{N\alpha_c}}{\det(\mathbf{A})^{\alpha_c}\Gamma\left(N\alpha_c+1\right)}\phi_2^{(N)}\left(\alpha_c,\cdots,\alpha_c;N\alpha_c+1;\frac{-z}{\hat{\lambda}_1},\cdots,\frac{-z}{\hat{\lambda}_N}\right),$$

here, $\mathbf{A}=\mathbf{DC}$, where $\mathbf{D}$ is the diagonal matrix with entries λ_i' and $\mathbf{C}$ is the symmetric positive definite (s.p.d.) $N\times N$ matrix defined by

$$\mathbf{C}=\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \sqrt{\rho_{12}} & \dots & \sqrt{\rho_{1N}} \\ \sqrt{\rho_{21}} & 1 & \dots & \sqrt{\rho_{2N}} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \ddots & \cdots \\ \sqrt{\rho_{N1}} & \cdots & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{13}$$

where ρ_{ij} denotes the correlation coefficient between Y_i and Y_j, and is given by,

$$\rho_{ij}=\rho_{ji}=\frac{cov(Y_i,Y_j)}{\sqrt{var(Y_i)var(Y_j)}}, 0\le\rho_{ij}\le 1, i,j=1,2,\cdots,N. \tag{14}$$

$cov(Y_i,Y_j)$ and $var(Y_i)$ denote the covariance between Y_i and Y_j and variance of Y_i, respectively. $\det(\mathbf{A})=\prod\limits_{i=1}^{N}\hat{\lambda}_i$ is the determinant of the matrix $\mathbf{A}$, and $\hat{\lambda}_i$s are the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}$. Note that $\hat{\lambda}_i>0\ \forall i$, since $\mathbf{C}$ is s.p.d. and the diagonal elements of $\mathbf{A}$ are equal to λ_i'. The functional form of cdf of sum of correlated gamma RVs is similar to the cdf of sum of i.n.i.d. gamma RVs. Hence the coverage probability in the presence of correlated interferers $P_c^c(T,r)$ can be similarly derived and one obtains

$$P_c^c(T,r)=\frac{\Gamma(N\alpha_c+\alpha_u)}{\Gamma(N\alpha_c+1)}\frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha_u)}\prod_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{\lambda}{\lambda+\hat{\lambda}_i r^{\beta}T}\right)^{\alpha_c} F_D^{(N)}\left[1-\alpha_u,\alpha_c,\cdots\alpha_c;N\alpha_c+1;\frac{\lambda}{\lambda+r^{\beta}\hat{\lambda}_1 T},\cdots\frac{\lambda}{\lambda+r^{\beta}\hat{\lambda}_N T}\right], \tag{15}$$

However, note that here the coverage probability is a function of the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}$ and the shape parameter of the user and interferer channels while in the i.n.i.d. case it was only a function of the shape parameters and scale parameters.

IV. Comparison of Coverage Probability

In this section, we compare the coverage probability in the i.n.i.d. case and correlated case, and analytically quantify the impact of correlation. Note that the coverage probability expression for the correlated case is derived when the interferers shape parameter are all equal and hence for a fair comparison we consider equal shape parameter for the i.n.i.d. case also, i.e., $\alpha_i = \alpha_c \ \forall i$. We first start with the special case when user channel's fading is Rayleigh (i.e, $\alpha_u = 1$) and interferers have Nakagami-m fading with arbitrary parameters. When $\alpha_u = 1$ and $\alpha_i = \alpha_c \ \forall i$, then the coverage probability in the i.n.i.d. case given in (12) reduces to

$$P_c(T,r) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\lambda + \lambda_i' r^\beta T} \right)^{\alpha_c} F_D^{(N)} \left[0, \alpha_c, \cdots, \alpha_c; \sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_c + 1; \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + r^\beta \lambda_1' T}, \cdots, \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + r^\beta \lambda_N' T} \right]. \tag{16}$$

Using the fact that $(0)_0 = 1$ and $(0)_k = 0 \ \forall \ k \geq 1$, the coverage probability is now given by

$$P_c(T,r) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \lambda'_i \frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}} \right)^{\alpha_c} \tag{17}$$

Similarly, the coverage probability in correlated case $P_c^c(T,r)$ is given by

$$P_c^c(T,r) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \left(\frac{1}{1 + \hat{\lambda}_i \frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}} \right)^{\alpha_c}. \tag{18}$$

We now state and prove the following theorem for the case where the user channel undergoes Rayleigh fading and interferers experience Nakagami-m fading and then generalize it to the case where user also experiences Nakagami-m fading.

Theorem 1. *The coverage probability in correlated case is higher than that of the i.n.i.d. case, when user's channel undergoes Rayleigh fading, i.e.,*

$$\prod_{i=1}^{N} \left(\frac{1}{1 + k\hat{\lambda}_i} \right)^{\alpha_c} \geq \prod_{i=1}^{N} \left(\frac{1}{1 + k\lambda_i'} \right)^{\alpha_c} \tag{19}$$

where $\hat{\lambda}_i$s are the eigenvalues of matrix $\mathbf{A}$ and λ_i's are the scale parameter for the i.n.i.d. case and $k = \frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}$ is a non negative constant.

Proof: Note that since $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{DC}$, the diagonal elements of $\mathbf{A}$ are λ_i's. We will briefly state two well known results from majorization theory[4] which we will use to prove Theorem 1.

Theorem 2. *If $\boldsymbol{H}$ is an $n \times n$ Hermitian matrix with diagonal elements $b_1, \cdots b_n$ and eigenvalues $a_1, \cdots a_n$ then*

$$\boldsymbol{a} \succ \boldsymbol{b} \tag{21}$$

Proof: The details of the proof can be found in [39, P. 300, B.1.]. ■

In our case, since $\hat{\lambda_i}$s are the eigenvalues and λ_i's are the diagonal elements of a symmetric matrix $\mathbf{A}$ hence from Theorem 2, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \succ \boldsymbol{\lambda'}$ where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = [\hat{\lambda_1}, \cdots, \hat{\lambda_n}]$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda'} = [\lambda_1', \cdots, \lambda_n']$.

Proposition 1. *If function ϕ is symmetric and convex, then ϕ is Schur-convex function. Consequently, $\boldsymbol{x} \succ \boldsymbol{y}$ implies $\phi(\boldsymbol{x}) \geq \phi(\boldsymbol{y})$.*

Proof: For the details of this proof please refer to [39, P. 97, C.2.]. ■

Now if it can be shown that $\prod_{i=1}^{N} \left(\frac{1}{1+k\lambda_i'}\right)^{\alpha_c}$ $\left(\text{ and } \prod_{i=1}^{N} \left(\frac{1}{1+k\hat{\lambda}_i}\right)^{\alpha_c}\right)$ is a Schur-convex function then by a simple application of Proposition 1 it is evident that $\prod_{i=1}^{N} \left(\frac{1}{1+k\hat{\lambda}_i}\right)^{\alpha_c} \geq \prod_{i=1}^{N} \left(\frac{1}{1+k\lambda_i'}\right)^{\alpha_c}$. To prove that $\prod_{i=1}^{N} \left(\frac{1}{1+kx_i}\right)^{\alpha_c}$ is a Schur convex function we need to show that it is a symmetric and convex function [39].

It is apparent that the function $\prod_{i=1}^{N} \left(\frac{1}{1+kx_i}\right)^{\alpha_c}$ is a symmetric function due to the fact that any two of its arguments can be interchanged without changing the value of the function. So we now need to show that the function $f(x_1, \cdots, x_n) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \left(\frac{1}{1+kx_i}\right)^{a_i}$ is a convex function where $x_i \geq 0$, $a_i > 0$. The function $f(x_1, \cdots, x_n)$ is convex if and only if its Hessian $\nabla^2 f$ is positive

[4]The notation $\boldsymbol{a} \succ \boldsymbol{b}$ indicate that vector $\boldsymbol{b}$ is majorized by vector $\boldsymbol{a}$. Let $\boldsymbol{a} = [a_1, \cdots a_n]$ and $\boldsymbol{b} = [b_1, \cdots b_n]$ with $a_1 \leq, \cdots, \leq a_n$ and $b_1 \leq, \cdots, \leq b_n$ then $\boldsymbol{a} \succ \boldsymbol{b}$ if and only if

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} b_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i, \ k = 1, \cdots, n-1, \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i. \tag{20}$$

semi-definite [40]. Now, $\nabla^2\ f$ can be computed as

$$\nabla^2\ f = k^2 \prod_{i=1}^{N} \left(\frac{1}{1+kx_i}\right)^{a_i} \begin{bmatrix} \frac{a_1(a_1+1)}{(1+kx_1)^2} & \frac{a_1a_2}{(1+kx_1)(1+kx_2)} & \cdots & \frac{a_1a_n}{(1+kx_1)(1+kx_n)} \\ \frac{a_1a_2}{(1+kx_1)(1+kx_2)} & \frac{a_2(a_2+1)}{(1+kx_2)^2} & \cdots & \frac{a_2a_n}{(1+kx_2)(1+kx_n)} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \ddots & \cdots \\ \frac{a_1a_n}{(1+kx_1)(1+kx_n)} & \frac{a_2a_n}{(1+kx_2)(1+kx_n)} & \cdots & \frac{a_n(a_n+1)}{(1+kx_n)^2} \end{bmatrix} \tag{22}$$

We now need to show that $\nabla^2\ f$ is a positive semi-definite matrix. For a real symmetric matrix $\boldsymbol{M}$, if $\boldsymbol{x}^T\boldsymbol{M}\boldsymbol{x} > 0$ for every $N \times 1$ nonzero real vector $\boldsymbol{x}$, then the matrix $\boldsymbol{M}$ is positive definite (p.d.) matrix [41, P. 566]. We now rewrite the Hessian matrix as sum of two matrices and it is then given by

$$\nabla^2\ f = k^2 \prod_{i=1}^{N} \left(\frac{1}{1+kx_i}\right)^{a_i} [\mathbf{P} + \mathbf{Q}]. \tag{23}$$

Here,

$$\mathbf{P} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{a_1^2}{(1+kx_1)^2} & \frac{a_1a_2}{(1+kx_1)(1+kx_2)} & \cdots & \frac{a_1a_n}{(1+kx_1)(1+kx_n)} \\ \frac{a_1a_2}{(1+kx_1)(1+kx_2)} & \frac{a_2^2}{(1+kx_2)^2} & \cdots & \frac{a_2a_n}{(1+kx_2)(1+kx_n)} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \ddots & \cdots \\ \frac{a_1a_n}{(1+kx_1)(1+kx_n)} & \frac{a_2a_n}{(1+kx_2)(1+kx_n)} & \cdots & \frac{a_n^2}{(1+kx_n)^2} \end{bmatrix} \tag{24}$$

and

$$\mathbf{Q} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{a_1}{(1+kx_1)^2} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{a_2}{(1+kx_2)^2} & \cdots & 0 \\ \cdots & \cdots & \ddots & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \frac{a_n}{(1+kx_n)^2} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{25}$$

Here by definition $k^2 \prod_{i=1}^{N} \left(\frac{1}{1+kx_i}\right)^{a_i} > 0$. If now both $\boldsymbol{P}$ and $\boldsymbol{Q}$ are p.d. then $\nabla^2\ f$ is p.d. Note that $\boldsymbol{P}$ can be written as $\boldsymbol{U}^T\boldsymbol{U}$ where $\boldsymbol{U} = \left[\frac{a_1}{(1+kx_1)}, \frac{a_2}{(1+kx_2)}, \cdots, \frac{a_n}{(1+kx_n)}\right]$ is a $N \times 1$ vector. Hence, $\boldsymbol{x}^T\boldsymbol{P}\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{x}^T(\boldsymbol{U}^T\boldsymbol{U})\boldsymbol{x} = ||\boldsymbol{U}\boldsymbol{x}||^2 > 0$ for every $N \times 1$ nonzero real vector $\boldsymbol{x}$. Thus, $\boldsymbol{P}$ is a p.d matrix. Since $\boldsymbol{Q}$ is a diagonal matrix with positive entries, $\boldsymbol{Q}$ is also a p.d matrix. Since sum of two p.d. matrix is p.d. matrix hence $\boldsymbol{P}+\boldsymbol{Q}$ is a p.d. matrix. Thus, $\nabla^2\ f$ is a p.d. matrix and $f(x_1, \cdots, x_n) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \left(\frac{1}{1+kx_i}\right)^{a_i}$ is a convex function.

Since $\prod_{i=1}^{N} \left(\frac{1}{1+kx_i}\right)^{\alpha_c}$ is a convex function and a symmetric function therefore, it is a Schur-convex function. We have shown that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \succ \boldsymbol{\lambda'}$ and $\prod_{i=1}^{N} \left(\frac{1}{1+kx_i}\right)^{\alpha_c}$ is a Schur-convex function.

Therefore, from Proposition 1, $\prod_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{1}{1+k\hat{\lambda}_i}\right)^{\alpha_c} \geq \prod_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{1}{1+k\lambda_i'}\right)^{\alpha_c}$. ■

Thus, the coverage probability in the presence of correlation among the interferers is greater than or equal to the coverage probability in the i.n.i.d. case, when user channel undergoes Rayleigh fading and the interferers shape parameter $\alpha_i = \alpha_c \ \forall i$. Now, we compare the coverage probability for general case, i.e., when α_u is arbitrary.

Theorem 3. *The coverage probability in the presence of the correlated interferers is greater than or equal to the coverage probability in presence of i.n.i.d. interferers, when user channel's shape parameter is less than or equal to* 1*, i.e.,* $\alpha_u \leq 1$*. When* $\alpha_u > 1$*, coverage probability in the presence of i.n.i.d. is not always lesser than the coverage probability in the presence of correlated interferers.*

Proof: Please see Appendix. ■

Summarizing, the coverage probability in the presence of correlated interferers is greater than or equal to the coverage probability in presence of independent interferers, when user channel's shape parameter is less than or equal to 1, i.e., $\alpha_u \leq 1$. When $\alpha_u > 1$, one can not say whether coverage probability is better in correlated interferer case or independent interferer case. Note that when $\alpha_u \leq 1$, usually the interferers α_i is also smaller than 1. However, the proof we have holds for both $\alpha_i > 1$ and $\alpha_i < 1$.

V. Comparison of Rate

In this section, we compare the average rate when interferers are i.n.i.d with the average rate when the interferers are correlated. We first start with the special case, where $\alpha_u \leq 1$, while the interferer's shape parameter is arbitrary. Then, the general case is analysed, i.e., when user's shape parameter and interferers shape parameter both can be arbitrary, and the scale parameters are also arbitrary.

A. When user's shape parameter is less than or equal to 1.

The average rate of a user at a distance r is $R(r) = E[\ln(1+\eta(r))]$. Using the fact that for a positive RV X, $E[X] = \int\limits_{t>0} P(X > T)\mathrm{d}t$, one obtains

$$R(r) = \int\limits_{t>0} P[\ln(1+\eta(r)) > t]\mathrm{d}t. \tag{26}$$

$$R(r) \overset{(a)}{=} \int_{t>0} P[\eta(r) > e^t - 1]\mathrm{d}t. \tag{27}$$

Here (a) follows from the fact that $\ln(1+\eta(r))$ is a monotonic increasing function for $\eta(r)$. Similarly, for correlated case, average rate at distance r, $\hat{R}(r)$ is given by

$$\hat{R}(r) = \int_{t>0} P[\hat{\eta}(r) > e^t - 1]\mathrm{d}t. \tag{28}$$

Here $\hat{\eta}(r)$ denotes the SIR experienced by the user when interferers are correlated. Now, we compare $R(r)$ and $\hat{R}(r)$ when $\alpha_u \leq 1$ to see the impact of correlation on the average rate. The integrands of (27) and (28), i.e., $P[\eta(r) > e^t - 1]$ and $P[\hat{\eta}(r) > e^t - 1]$ are equivalent to the coverage probability expressions for independent interferers case and for correlated interferers case evaluated at $T = e^t - 1$, respectively. It has been shown in Theorem 3 that the coverage probability in the presence of the correlated interferers is greater than or equal to the coverage probability in the presence of independent interferers, when $\alpha_u \leq 1$. In other words, $P[\hat{\eta}(r) > e^t - 1] \geq P[\eta(r) > e^t - 1]$, $\forall\ t$ when $\alpha_u \leq 1$. Therefore, it is apparent from (27) and (28) that $\hat{R}(r) > R(r)$, when $\alpha_u \leq 1$ since for both integration is over the same interval.

Now, we will compare the average rate when both α_u and $\alpha_i = \alpha_c\ \forall i$ are arbitrary. It is difficult to compare the rate using the approach given above for $\alpha_u \leq 1$ since coverage probability in the presence of the correlated interferers can be greater or lower to the coverage probability in the presence of independent interferers, when $\alpha_u > 1$ (See Appendix for more detail). Hence we compare the average rate using stochastic ordering theory.

B. When both user's shape parameter and interferer's shape parameter are arbitrary

In this subsection, we compare $R = E[\ln(1+\frac{S}{I})]$, and $\hat{R} = E[\ln(1+\frac{S}{\hat{I}})]$ for arbitrary values of shape parameter. Here $\eta(r) = \frac{S}{I}$ and $\hat{\eta}(r) = \frac{S}{\hat{I}}$, where S is the desired user channel power. Using iterated expectation one can rewrite the rates as

$$R = E_S\left[E_I\left[\ln\left(1+\frac{S}{I}\right)\middle|S=s\right]\right],\ \text{and}\ \hat{R} = E_S\left[E_{\hat{I}}\left[\ln\left(1+\frac{S}{\hat{I}}\right)\middle|S=s\right]\right]. \tag{29}$$

Since the expectation operator preserves inequalities, therefore if we can show that $E_{\hat{I}}\left[\ln\left(1+\frac{S}{\hat{I}}\right)\middle|S=s\right] \geq E_I\left[\ln\left(1+\frac{S}{I}\right)\middle|S=s\right]$, then this implies $\hat{R} \geq R$.

Here I and $\hat{I}$ are the sum of independent and correlated interferers, respectively. The sum of interference power in the i.n.i.d. case can be written as

$$I = \sum_{i=1}^{N} h_i' = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \lambda_i' G_i \text{ with } h_i' \sim \mathcal{G}(\alpha_c, \lambda_i') \text{ and } G_i \sim \mathcal{G}(\alpha_c, 1) \tag{30}$$

Similarly, for the correlated case,

$$\hat{I} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \hat{h}_i = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \hat{\lambda}_i G_i, \tag{31}$$

where $\hat{h}_i \sim \mathcal{G}(\alpha_c, \lambda_i')$. Recall that these $\hat{h}_i$ are correlated with the correlation structure defined by correlation matrix $\boldsymbol{C}$ given in (13), and $\hat{\lambda}_i$s are the eigenvalues of the matrix $\boldsymbol{A} = \boldsymbol{DC}$. In other words one can obtain a correlated sum of gamma variates by multiplying independent and identical distributed (i.i.d.) gamma variates with weight $\hat{\lambda}_i$s. We now briefly state the theorems in stochastic order theory that we will use to show that $\hat{R}$ is always greater than equal to R.

Theorem 4. *Let $X_1, X_2, \cdots, X_N$ be exchangeable RVs. Let $\boldsymbol{a} = (a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_N)$ and $\boldsymbol{b} = (b_1, b_2, \cdots, b_N)$ be two vectors of constants. If $\boldsymbol{a} \prec \boldsymbol{b}$, then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i X_i \leq_{cx} \sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i X_i. \tag{32}$$

Proof: The details of the proof is given in [42, Theorem 3.A.35]. ■

Here the notation $X \leq_{cx} Y$ denote that X is smaller than Y in convex order[5]. Also, note that a sequence of RVs $X_1, \cdots X_N$ is said to be exchangeable if for all N and $\pi \in S(N)$ it holds that $X_1 \cdots X_N \overset{\mathcal{D}}{=} X_{\pi(1)} \cdots X_{\pi(N)}$ where $S(N)$ is the group of permutations of $\{1, \cdots N\}$ and $\overset{\mathcal{D}}{=}$ denotes equality in distribution [43]. Furthermore, if X_is are identically distributed, they are exchangeable [42, P. 129]. Hence G_is are exchangeable since they are identically distributed. It has already been shown that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \succ \boldsymbol{\lambda'}$ in Section IV. Hence by a direct application of Theorem 4, one obtains, $I \leq_{cx} \hat{I}$.

Theorem 5. *If $X \leq_{cx} Y$ and $f(.)$ is convex, then $E[f(X)] \leq E[f(Y)]$.*

Proof: The details of the proof is given in [44, Theorem 7.6.2]. ■

[5]If X and Y are two RVs such that $E[\phi(X)] \leq E[\phi(Y)]$ for all convex function $\phi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, provided the expectation exist. Then X is said to be smaller than Y in the convex order.

$\ln(1+\frac{k}{x})$ is a convex function when $k \geq 0$ and $x \geq 0$ due to the fact that double differentiation of $\ln(1+\frac{k}{x})$ is always non negative, i.e., $\frac{\partial \frac{\partial \ln\left(\frac{k}{x}+1\right)}{\partial x}}{\partial x} = \frac{k(k+2x)}{x^2(k+x)^2} \geq 0$. Note that S and I are non negative RVs, hence by a direct application of Theorem 5, one obtains

$$E_{\hat{I}}\left[\ln\left(1+\frac{S}{\hat{I}}\right)\middle|S=s\right] \geq E_I\left[\ln\left(1+\frac{S}{I}\right)\middle|S=s\right] \tag{33}$$

Since expectation preserve inequalities therefore, $E_S[E_I[\ln(1+\frac{S}{I})]] \leq E_S[E_{\hat{I}}[\ln(1+\frac{S}{\hat{I}})]]$. In other words, positive correlation among the interferers increases the average rate.

Summarizing, the average rate in the presence of the positive correlated interferers is always greater than or equal to the average rate in the presence of independent interferers. Now we briefly discuss the utility of our results in the presence of log normal fading.

C. Log Normal Shadowing

Although all the analysis so far (comparison of the coverage probability and average rate) considered only small scale fading and path loss, the analysis can be further extended to take into account shadowing effects. In general, the large scale fading, i.e, log normal shadowing is modeled by zero-mean log-normal distribution which is given by,

$$f_X(x) = \frac{1}{x\sqrt{2\pi(\frac{\sigma_{dB}}{8.686})^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\ln^2(x)}{2(\frac{\sigma_{dB}}{8.686})^2}\right), x > 0,$$

where σ_{dB} is the shadow standard deviation represented in dB. Typically the value of σ_{dB} varies from 3 dB to 10 dB [15], [45]. It is shown in [46] that the pdf of the composite fading channel (fading and shadowing) can be expressed using the generalized-K (Gamma-Gamma) model. Also in [47], it has been shown that the generalized-K pdf can be well approximated by Gamma pdf $\mathcal{G}(\alpha_l, \lambda_l)$ using the moment matching method, with α_l and λ_l are given by

$$\alpha_l = \frac{1}{(\frac{1}{\alpha_u}+1)\exp((\frac{\sigma_{dB}}{8.686})^2)-1} = \frac{\alpha_u}{(\alpha_u+1)\exp((\frac{\sigma_{dB}}{8.686})^2)-\alpha_u} \tag{34}$$

$$\text{and } \lambda_l = (1+\alpha_u)\lambda_u \exp\left(\frac{3(\frac{\sigma_{dB}}{8.686})^2}{2}\right) - \alpha_u\lambda_u \exp\left(\frac{(\frac{\sigma_{dB}}{8.686})^2}{2}\right) \tag{35}$$

Thus, SIR η_l of a user can now given by

$$\eta_l(r) = \frac{Pg_l r^{-\beta}}{\sum\limits_{i\in\phi} Ph_i^l d_i^{-\beta}} \tag{36}$$

where $g_l \sim \mathcal{G}(\alpha_l, \lambda_l)$ and $h_i^l \sim \mathcal{G}(\alpha_i^l, \lambda_i^l)$. Here $\alpha_i^l = \frac{1}{(\frac{1}{\alpha_i}+1)\exp((\frac{\sigma_{dB}}{8.686})^2)-1}$ and $\lambda_i^l = (1+\alpha_i)\lambda_i \exp\left(\frac{3(\frac{\sigma_{dB}}{8.686})^2}{2}\right) - \alpha_i\lambda_i \exp\left(\frac{(\frac{\sigma_{dB}}{8.686})^2}{2}\right)$. One can now derive the coverage probability expression in the presence of log-normal shadowing $P_c^l(T,r)$ using the methods in Section II to obtain,

$$P_c^l(T,r) = \frac{\Gamma\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i^l+\alpha_l\right)}{\Gamma\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i^l+1\right)\Gamma(\alpha_l)} \prod_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{\lambda_l}{\lambda_l+\lambda_i^l d_i^{-\beta} r^\beta T}\right)^{\alpha_i^l} \times$$

$$F_D^{(N)}\left[1-\alpha_l, \alpha_1^l, \cdots, \alpha_N^l; \sum_{i=1}^{N}\alpha_i^l+1; \frac{\lambda_l}{\lambda_l+r^\beta\lambda_1^l d_1^{-\beta}T}, \cdots, \frac{\lambda_l}{\lambda_l+r^\beta\lambda_N^l d_N^{-\beta}T}\right] \tag{37}$$

Further, the correlation coefficient between two identically distributed generalized-K RVs is derived in [48, Lemma 1], and it is in terms of correlation coefficient of the RVs corresponding to the short term fading component ($\rho_{i,j}$) and the correlation coefficient of the RVs corresponding to the shadowing component($\rho_{i,j}^s$). The resultant correlation coefficient ($\rho_{i,j}^l$) is then given by

$$\rho_{i,j}^l = \frac{\frac{\rho_{i,j}}{\left(\exp(\frac{\sigma_{dB}}{8.686})^2)-1\right)} + \rho_{i,j}^s\alpha_c + \rho_{i,j}\rho_{i,j}^s}{\alpha_c + \frac{1}{\left(\exp(\frac{\sigma_{dB}}{8.686})^2)-1\right)} + 1} \tag{38}$$

Now, similar to the independent case, the coverage probability for correlated interferers case $\tilde{P_c}^l(T,r)$ is given by given by

$$\tilde{P_c}^l(T,r) = \frac{\Gamma\left(N\alpha_c^l+\alpha_l\right)}{\Gamma\left(N\alpha_c^l+1\right)\Gamma(\alpha_l)} \prod_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{\lambda_l}{\lambda_l+\hat{\lambda}_i^l r^\beta T}\right)^{\alpha_i^l} \times \tag{39}$$

$$F_D^{(N)}\left[1-\alpha_l, \alpha_c^l, \cdots, \alpha_c^l; N\alpha_c^l+1; \frac{\lambda_l}{\lambda_l+r^\beta\hat{\lambda}_1^l T}, \cdots, \frac{\lambda_l}{\lambda_l+r^\beta\hat{\lambda}_N^l T}\right] \tag{40}$$

where $\hat{\lambda}_i^l$s are the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}^l = \mathbf{D}^l\mathbf{C}^l$, where $\mathbf{D}^l$ is the diagonal matrix with entries $\lambda_i^l d_i^{-\beta}$ and $\mathbf{C}^l$ is defined by

$$\mathbf{C}^l = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \sqrt{\rho_{12}^l} & \ldots & \sqrt{\rho_{1N}^l} \\ \sqrt{\rho_{21}^l} & 1 & \ldots & \sqrt{\rho_{2N}^l} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \ddots & \cdots \\ \sqrt{\rho_{N1}^l} & \cdots & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{41}$$

with ρ_{ij}^l is given by (38). Note that both (37) and (40) have a similar functional form and they both are also similar to (12) and (15), respectively. Hence now the coverage probability and average rate for the i.n.i.d. case and correlated case can be compared using the methods outlined in Section IV and Section V. In other words, it can be shown that the coverage probability in the presence of correlated interferers is greater than or equal to the coverage probability in presence

of independent interferers, when user's shape parameter is less than or equal to 1, i.e., $\alpha_l \leq 1$, in the presence of shadow fading. Also, the average rate in the presence of positive correlated interferers is always greater than or equal to the average rate in the presence of independent interferers, in the presence of shadow fading.

D. Extension of this work for $\eta - \mu$ fading

Recently, the $\eta - \mu$ fading distribution with two shape parameters η and μ has been proposed to model a general non-line-of-sight propagation scenario [16]. It includes Nakagami-q (Hoyt), one sided Gaussian, Rayleigh and Nakagami-m as special cases. It has been shown in [49] that the sum of correlated $\eta - \mu$ power RVs with half integer or integer value of parameter μ can be represented by the sum of independent gamma RVs with suitable parameters. Hence, our analysis on the impact of correlation on the coverage probability and average rate can be extended to the scenarios where the user's channel experience Nakagami-m fading and interfering channel experience $\eta - \mu$ fading with half integer or integer value of parameter μ. Although, there is a restriction on the parameter μ, it still entitles us to include one-sided Gaussian, Rayleigh, Nakagami-q (Hoyt) and Nakagami-m (with integer m) fading for the interfering signal in our analysis.

In the next section, we will show simulation results and discuss how those match with the theoretical results. We also briefly discuss how the analysis carried out in this work can be of utility to the network and the user.

VI. Numerical Analysis and Application

In this section, we give some simulation results for the coverage probability and rate for both independent and correlated case. The impact of correlation among interferers on the coverage probability and rate is discussed and it is observed that in all simulations the rate is higher for the correlated case when compared to i.n.i.d. case. For the simulations, we consider a 19 cell system with hexagonal structure having inter cell site distance $2R = 1732$ meters as shown in Fig. 1. For each user which is connected to the 0th cell we generate the gamma RV corresponding to its own channel and gamma RVs corresponding to the 18 interferers and then compute SIR. Then, using the simulated SIR, the coverage probability and average rate can be obtained and they are averaged over 10000 times.


$\beta = 4, T = 3$ dB, $\lambda = 1, \lambda_i = 2$
Coverage Probability
Distance from Base station (m)
Analytical α=1.5, α_i=1
Simulation α=1.5, α_i=1
Analytical α=2.5, α_i=1
Simulation α=2.5, α_i=1
Analytical α=2.5, α_i=1.5
Simulation α=2.5, α_i=1.5

Fig. 2: Coverage Probability of a user with respect to distance from the BS in presence of Nakagami-m fading

Fig. 2 shows the impact of shape parameter on the coverage probability in the i.n.i.d. case. We first note that the simulation results exactly match with the analytical results (computed using Eq. (12)). Secondly, it can be observed that as user channel's shape parameter (α_u) increases while keeping the interferer shape parameters fixed, the coverage probability increases. Whereas, when interferer channel's shape parameter increases and the user channel's shape parameter is fixed, the coverage probability decreases as expected.

Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 depict the impact of correlation among the interferers on the coverage probability for different values of shape parameter. The correlation among the interferers is defined by the correlation matrix in (13) with $\rho_{pq} = \rho^{|p-q|}$ where $p, q = 1, \cdots, N$ [33]. From Fig. 3, it can be observed that for $\alpha_u = 0.5$ and $\alpha_u = 1$, coverage probability in presence of correlation is higher than that of independent scenario (which match our analytical result). For example, at $\alpha_u = 0.5$, coverage probability increases from 0.12 in the i.n.i.d case to 0.22 in the correlated case and at $\alpha_u = 1$, coverage probability increases from 0.07 to 0.12 when user is at distance 900m from the BS. In Fig. 4, where $\alpha_u > 1$, one cannot say that coverage probability in presence of correlation is higher or lower than that of independent scenario. However, it can be seen that when α_u is significantly higher than the interferers shape parameter (i.e., user channel

sees less fading than interferers channel), coverage probability in the presence of independent interferers dominates over the coverage probability in the presence of correlated interferers. While if α_u is comparable to the interferers channel shape parameter, the coverage probability of independent interferers is higher than the coverage probability of correlated interferers when user is close to the BS. However, the coverage probability of independent interferers is significantly lower than the coverage probability of correlated interferers when the user is far from the BS.



Fig. 3: Impact of correlation among the interferers on the coverage probability for different value of shape parameter, when $\alpha_u \leq 1$.

A. How the User can Exploit Correlation among Interferers

We will now briefly discuss how the user in a cellular network can exploit knowledge of positive correlation among its interferers. We compare the coverage probability in the presence of correlated interferers for single input single output (SISO) network with the coverage probability in the presence of independent interferers for single input multiple output (SIMO) network to show that the impact of correlation is significant for the cell-edge users (users not near the BS). For the SIMO network, it is assumed that each user is equipped with 2 antennas and both antennas at the user are used for reception since downlink is considered. A linear minimum mean-square-error (LMMSE) receiver [50] is considered. In order to calculate coverage probability



Fig. 4: Impact of correlation among the interferers on the coverage probability for different value of shape parameter, when $\alpha_u > 1$.

with a LMMSE receiver, it is assumed that the closest interferer can be completely cancelled at the SIMO receiver. Fig. 5 plots the SISO coverage probability in the presence of correlated interferers case and the coverage probability in the presence of i.n.i.d. interferers for a SIMO network. It can be seen that for $\rho = 0.98$, the SISO coverage probability for the correlated case[6] is higher than the SIMO coverage probability for i.n.i.d. case. However, for $\rho = 0.81$, SISO coverage probability is close to the SIMO coverage probability at the cell-edge. For example, the coverage probabilities for $\rho = 0.98$, $\rho = 0.81$ and the SIMO case with i.n.i.d. interferers are 0.256, 0.2 and 0.18, respectively, when user is at distance 900m from the BS. In other words, correlation among the interferers seems to be as good as having one additional antenna at the receiver capable of cancelling the dominant interferer.

Fig. 6 shows the average rate in the presence of correlation among the interferers and the average rate in the presence of independent interferers for SISO case. It can be observed that average rate is higher in the presence of correlated interferers. It can be also seen that for

[6]The correlation among the interferers is defined by the correlation matrix in (13) with $\rho_{pq} = \rho^{|p-q|}$ where $p, q = 1, \cdots, N$



Fig. 5: Comparison of coverage probability of correlated interferers with the coverage probability of SIMO network. Here $\alpha_u = \alpha_i = 1$.

$\rho = 0.98$, average rate for the correlated case is higher than that of the 1×2 SIMO network. For example, average rates for $\rho = 0.98$, the SIMO case and independent case are 1.41 nats/Hz, 1.28 nats/Hz and 1.09 nats/Hz, respectively, when user is at distance 600m from the BS.

Fig. 7 presents the comparison of average rate in the presence of log normal shadowing. It can be seen that for both $\rho = 0.98$ and $\rho = 0.81$, the average rate of the correlated case is higher than that of the 1×2 SIMO network with $\rho = 0$. In other words, in presence of shadowing the impact of correlation is even more significant. For example, average rates for SISO case with $\rho = 0.98$, the SIMO case with $\rho = 0$, and the SISO case with $\rho = 0$ are 1.25 nats/Hz, 0.86 nats/Hz and 0.71 nats/Hz, respectively when the user is at distance 700m from the BS. Obviously, if one had correlated interferers in the SIMO system that would again lead to improved coverage probability and average rate and may be compared to a SIMO system with higher number of antennas. In all three cases, it is apparent that if the correlation among the interferers is exploited, it leads to performance results for a SISO system which are comparable to the performance of a 1×2 SIMO system with independent interferers.

We would also likely to briefly point out that the impact of correlation among the interferers is like that of introducing interference alignment in a system. Interference alignment actually



Fig. 6: Comparison of the average rate in presence of independent interferers with the average rate in presence of correlated interferers.



Fig. 7: Comparison of the average rate in the presence of log normal shadowing.

aligns interference using appropriate precoding so as reduce the number of interferers one needs to cancel. Here the physical nature of the wireless channel and the presence of co-located interferers also “aligns” the interferer partially. This is the reason one can get a gain equivalent

to 1×2 system in a 1×1 system with correlated interferers provided the user knows about the correlation.

Summarizing, our work is able to analytically shows the impact of correlated interferers on coverage probability and rate. This can be used by the network and user to decide whether one wants to use the antennas at the receiver for diversity gain or interference cancellation depending on the information available about interferers correlation. Note that interferers from adjacent sector of a BS will definitely be correlated [11]–[15]. We believe that this correlation should be exploited, since the analysis shows that knowledge of correlation will lead to higher coverage probability and rate.

VII. Conclusions

In this work, the coverage probability expressions and rate expressions have been compared analytically for following two cases: (a) Interferers and user channel having arbitrary Nakagami-m fading parameters. (b) Interferers being correlated where the correlation is specified by a correlation matrix. We have shown that the coverage probability in correlated interferer case is higher than that of the independent case, when the user channel's shape parameter is lesser than or equal to one, and the interferers have Nakagami-m fading with arbitrary parameters. Further, it has been shown that positive correlation among the interferers always increases the average rate. We have also taken into account the shadow fading component in our analysis. The impact of correlation seems even more pronounced in the presence of shadow fading. Our results indicate that if the user is aware of the interferers correlation matrix then it can exploit it since the correlated interferers behave like partially aligned interferers. This means that if the user is aware of the correlation then one can obtain a rate equivalent to a 1×2 system in a 1×1 system depending on the correlation matrix structure. Extensive simulations were performed and these match with the theoretical results.

Appendix

Proof of Theorem 3

The coverage probability expressions for the scenario when interferers are i.n.i.d. and the scenario when interferers are correlated are given in (12) and (15), respectively and rewriting

them for the case when $\alpha_i = \alpha_c \ \forall i$, one obtains

$$P_c(T,r) = K' F_D^{(N)}\left[1-\alpha_u, \alpha_c, \cdots, \alpha_c; N\alpha_c+1; \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + r^\beta \lambda_1' T}, \cdots, \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + r^\beta \lambda_N' T}\right] \tag{42}$$

$$P_c^c(T,r) = \hat{K} F_D^{(N)}\left[1-\alpha_u, \alpha_c, \cdots, \alpha_c; N\alpha_c+1; \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + r^\beta \hat{\lambda}_1 T}, \cdots, \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + r^\beta \hat{\lambda}_N T}\right], \tag{43}$$

where $K' = \frac{\Gamma(N\alpha_c+\alpha_u)}{\Gamma(N\alpha_c+1)}\frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha_u)}\prod_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{1}{1+\lambda_i'\frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}}\right)^{\alpha_c}$ and $\hat{K} = \frac{\Gamma(N\alpha_c+\alpha_u)}{\Gamma(N\alpha_c+1)}\frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha_u)}\prod_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{1}{1+\hat{\lambda}_i\frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}}\right)^{\alpha_c}$. From Theorem 1 it is clear that $\hat{K} > K'$. Now, we need to compare the Lauricella's function of the fourth kind of (42) and (43). Here, for comparison we use the series expression for $F_D(.)$.

We expand the series expression for the Lauricella's function of the fourth kind in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} F_D^{(N)}[a,b,\cdots,b;c;x_1,\cdots,x_N] =& 1 + K_{1,1}\sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i + K_{2,1}\sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i^2 + K_{2,2}\sum_{1\le i<j\le N} x_i x_j + K_{3,1}\sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i^3 \\ &+ K_{3,2}\sum_{i,j=1,s.t.i\neq j}^{N} x_i^2 x_j + K_{3,3}\sum_{1\le i<j<k\le N} x_i x_j x_k + \cdots \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

where $K_{1,1} = \frac{(a)_1(b)_1}{(c)_1 1!}$, $K_{2,1} = \frac{(a)_2(b)_2}{(c)_2 2!}$, $K_{2,2} = \frac{(a)_2(b)_1(b)_1}{(c)_2 1!1!}$, $K_{3,1} = \frac{(a)_3(b)_3}{(c)_3 3!}$, $K_{3,2} = \frac{(a)_3(b)_2(b)_1}{(c)_3 2!1!}$, $K_{3,3} = \frac{(a)_3(b)_1(b)_1(b)_1}{(c)_3 1!1!1!}$ and so on.

Hence the coverage probability for independent case given in (42) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} P_c(T,r) =& K'\Bigg[1 + K_{1,1}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{1}{1+\lambda_i'\frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}}\right) + K_{2,1}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{1}{1+\lambda_i'\frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}}\right)^2 + K_{3,1}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{1}{1+\lambda_i'\frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}}\right)^3 + \\ & K_{2,2}\sum_{1\le i<j\le N}\left(\frac{1}{1+\lambda_i'\frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}}\right)\left(\frac{1}{1+\lambda_j'\frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}}\right) + K_{3,2}\sum_{i,j=1,s.t.i\neq j}^{N}\left(\frac{1}{1+\lambda_i'\frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{1+\lambda_j'\frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}}\right) + \\ & K_{3,3}\sum_{1\le i<j<k\le N}\left(\frac{1}{1+\lambda_i'\frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}}\right)\left(\frac{1}{1+\lambda_j'\frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}}\right)\left(\frac{1}{1+\lambda_k'\frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}}\right) + \cdots\Bigg] \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

Similarly, for the correlated case the coverage probability given in (43) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} P_c^c(T,r) =& \hat{K}\Bigg[1 + K_{1,1}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{1}{1+\hat{\lambda}_i\frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}}\right) + K_{2,1}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{1}{1+\hat{\lambda}_i\frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}}\right)^2 + K_{3,1}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{1}{1+\hat{\lambda}_i\frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}}\right)^3 + \\ & K_{2,2}\sum_{1\le i<j\le N}\left(\frac{1}{1+\hat{\lambda}_i\frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}}\right)\left(\frac{1}{1+\hat{\lambda}_j\frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}}\right) + K_{3,2}\sum_{i,j=1,s.t.i\neq j}^{N}\left(\frac{1}{1+\hat{\lambda}_i\frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}}\right)^2\left(\frac{1}{1+\hat{\lambda}_j\frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}}\right) + \\ & K_{3,3}\sum_{1\le i<j<k\le N}\left(\frac{1}{1+\hat{\lambda}_i\frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}}\right)\left(\frac{1}{1+\hat{\lambda}_j\frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}}\right)\left(\frac{1}{1+\hat{\lambda}_k\frac{r^\beta T}{\lambda}}\right) + \cdots\Bigg] \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

Here $K_{1,1} = \frac{(1-\alpha_u)_1(\alpha_c)_1}{(N\alpha_c+1)_1 1!}$, $K_{2,1} = \frac{(1-\alpha_u)_2(\alpha_c)_2}{(N\alpha_c+1)_2 2!}$, $K_{2,2} = \frac{(1-\alpha_u)_2(\alpha_c)_1(\alpha_c)_1}{(N\alpha_c+1)_2 1!1!}$, $K_{3,1} = \frac{(1-\alpha_u)_3(\alpha_c)_3}{(N\alpha_c+1)_3 3!}$, $K_{3,2} = \frac{(1-\alpha_u)_3(\alpha_c)_2(\alpha_c)_1}{(N\alpha_c+1)_3 2!1!}$, $K_{3,3} = \frac{(1-\alpha_u)_3(\alpha_c)_1(\alpha_c)_1(\alpha_c)_1}{(N\alpha_c+1)_3 1!1!1!}$ and so on. Note that here $K_{i,j}$ are the same for both $P_c(T,r)$ and $P_c^c(T,r)$. Now, we want to show that each summation term in the series expression is a Schur-convex function.

Each summation term in the series expression is symmetrical due to the fact that any two of its argument can be interchanged without changing the value of the function. We have already shown that $\prod_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{1}{1+kx_i}\right)^{a_i}$ is a convex function $\forall x_i \geq 0$ and $\forall a_i > 0$. Now, the terms in the summation terms in (45) and (46) are of the form $\prod_{i=1}^{M}\left(\frac{1}{1+kx_i}\right)^{a_i}$ where $M \leq N$. To show that these functions are convex function we need to show that the corresponding Hessian are p.d. The corresponding Hessians are nothing but principal sub-matrices of the matrix in (22). Hence using the fact that every principal sub-matrix of a s.p.d. matrix is a s.p.d. matrix [41], one can show that each term of each summation term is a convex function. Using the fact that convexity is preserved under summation one can show that each summation term is a convex function. Thus, each summation term in series expression is a Schur-convex function.

Now we consider following two cases.

Case I when $\alpha_u < 1$: Since $\alpha_u < 1$, so $1 - \alpha_u > 0$ and hence all the constant $K_{i,j} > 0 \ \forall \ i,j$. Each summation term in series expression of coverage probability for correlated case is greater than or equal to the corresponding summation term in the series expression of coverage probability for independent case. Thus, if user channel's shape parameter $\alpha_u < 1$ then coverage probability of correlated case is greater than or equal to the coverage probability for independent case.

Case II when $\alpha_u > 1$: Since $\alpha_u > 1$, then $1-\alpha_u < 0$ and hence $K_{i,j} < 0 \ \forall i \in 2|\mathbb{Z}|+1$ and $\forall j$ where set $\mathbb{Z}$ denote the integer number, due to the fact that $(a)_N < 0$ if $a < 0$ and $N \in 2|\mathbb{Z}|+1$. Whereas, $K_{i,j} > 0 \ \forall i \in 2|\mathbb{Z}|$ and $\forall j$ due of the fact that $(a)_N > 0$ if $a < 0$ and $N \in 2|\mathbb{Z}|$. Thus, if $\alpha_u > 1$, we cannot state whether the coverage probability of one case is greater than or lower than the other case.

REFERENCES

[1] A. Goldsmith, *Wireless Communications*. Cambridge university press, 2005.

[2] A. Abu-Dayya and N. Beaulieu, "Outage Probabilities of Cellular Mobile Radio Systems with Multiple Nakagami Interferers," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 757–768, 1991.

[3] Q. Zhang, "Outage Probability in Cellular Mobile Radio Due to Nakagami Signal and Interferers with Arbitrary Parameters," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 364–372, 1996.

[4] ——, "Outage Probability of Cellular Mobile Radio in the Presence of Multiple Nakagami Interferers with Arbitrary Fading Parameters," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 661–667, 1995.

[5] C. Tellambura, "Cochannel Interference Computation for Arbitrary Nakagami Fading," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 487–489, 1999.

[6] M.-S. Alouini, A. Abdi, and M. Kaveh, "Sum of Gamma Variates and Performance of Wireless Communication Systems over Nakagami-Fading Channels," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 1471–1480, 2001.

[7] I. Trigui, A. Laourine, S. Affes, and A. Stephenne, "Outage Analysis of Wireless Systems over Composite Fading/Shadowing Channels with Co-Channel Interference," in *Wireless Communications and Networking Conference, 2009. WCNC 2009. IEEE*, 2009, pp. 1–6.

[8] M. Hadzialic, S. Colo, and A. Sarajlic, "An Analytical Approach to Probability of Outage Evaluation in Gamma Shadowed Nakagami-m and Rice Fading Channel," in *ELMAR, 2007*, 2007, pp. 223–227.

[9] Q. Liu, Z. Zhong, B. Ai, M. Wang, and C. Briso-Rodriguez, "Exact Outage Probability Caused by Multiple Nakagami Interferers with Arbitrary Parameters," in *IEEE 72nd Vehicular Technology Conference Fall 2010 (VTC 2010-Fall)*, 2010, pp. 1–5.

[10] A. Annamalai, C. Tellambura, and V. K. Bhargava, "Simple and Accurate Methods for Outage Analysis in Cellular Mobile Radio Systems-A Unified Approach," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 303–316, 2001.

[11] V. Graziano, "Propagation Correlations at 900 MHz," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 182–189, 1978.

[12] E. Perahia, D. Cox, and S. Ho, "Shadow Fading Cross Correlation Between Basestations," in *IEEE VTS 53rd Vehicular Technology Conference, 2001. VTC 2001 Spring.*, vol. 1, 2001, pp. 313–317 vol.1.

[13] F. Graziosi and F. Santucci, "A General Correlation Model for Shadow Fading in Mobile Radio Systems," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 102–104, 2002.

[14] S. Szyszkowicz, H. Yanikomeroglu, and J. Thompson, "On the Feasibility of Wireless Shadowing Correlation Models," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 59, no. 9, pp. 4222–4236, 2010.

[15] 3GPP, "Further Advancements for E-UTRA Physical Layer Aspects (release 9)," *3GPP TR 36.814 V9.0.0 (2010-03)*, 2010.

[16] M. Yacoub, "The κ-μ Distribution and the η-μ Distribution," *IEEE Antennas and Propagation Magazine*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 68–81, Feb 2007.

[17] D. Morales-Jimenez, J. Paris, and A. Lozano, "Outage Probability Analysis for MRC in η-μ Fading Channels with Co-Channel Interference," *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 674–677, May 2012.

[18] J. F. Paris, "Outage Probability in η-μ/η-μ and κ-μ/η-μ Interference-Limited Scenarios," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 61, no. 1, pp. 335–343, 2013.

[19] N. Ermolova and O. Tirkkonen, "Outage Probability Analysis in Generalized Fading Channels with Co-Channel Interference and Background Noise: η-μ/η-μ, η-μ/κ-μ, and κ-μ/η-μ; Scenarios," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 291–297, January 2014.

[20] V. A. Aalo, "Performance of Maximal-Ratio Diversity Systems in a Correlated Nakagami-Fading Environment," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 43, no. 8, pp. 2360–2369, Aug 1995.

[21] V. A. Aalo, T. Piboongungon, and G. P. Efthymoglou, "Another Look at the Performance of MRC Schemes in Nakagami-

m Fading Channels with Arbitrary Parameters," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 53, no. 12, pp. 2002–2005, 2005.

[22] V. A. Aalo, and G. P. Efthymoglou, "On the MGF and BER of Linear Diversity Schemes in Nakagami Fading Channels with Arbitrary Parameters," in *IEEE 69th Vehicular Technology Conference, 2009. VTC Spring 2009.*, 2009, pp. 1–5.

[23] K. Peppas, F. Lazarakis, T. Zervos, A. Alexandridis, and K. Dangakis, "Sum of Non-Identical Independent Squared η-μ Variates and Applications in the Performance Analysis of DS-CDMA Systems," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 9, no. 9, pp. 2718–2723, 2010.

[24] R. Annavajjala, A. Chockalingam, and L. Milstein, "Performance Analysis of Coded Communication Systems on Nakagami Fading Channels with Selection Combining Diversity," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 52, no. 7, pp. 1214–1220, 2004.

[25] H. Shin and J. H. Lee, "On the Error Probability of Binary and M-ary Signals in Nakagami-m Fading Channels," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 536–539, 2004.

[26] O. Ugweje, "Selection Diversity for Wireless Communications in Nakagami-fading with Arbitrary Parameters," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 1437–1448, 2001.

[27] D. S. Francesca, "A Characterization of the Distribution of a Weighted Sum of Gamma Variables Through Multiple Hypergeometric Functions," *Integral Transforms and Special Functions*, vol. 19, no. 8, pp. 563–575, 2008. [Online]. Available: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10652460802045258

[28] P. G. Moschopoulos, "The Distribution of the Sum of Independent Gamma Random Variables," *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math. (Part A)*, vol. 37, pp. 541–544, 1985.

[29] S. Nadarajah, "A Review of Results on Sums of Random Variables," *Acta Applicandae Mathematicae*, vol. 103, no. 2, pp. 131–140, 2008. [Online]. Available: http://www.springerlink.com/index/10.1007/s10440-008-9224-4

[30] G. Karagiannidis, N. Sagias, and T. Tsiftsis, "Closed-Form Statistics for the Sum of Squared Nakagami-m Variates and its Applications," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 54, no. 8, pp. 1353–1359, 2006.

[31] J. F. Paris, "A Note on the Sum of Correlated Gamma Random Variables," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1103.0505, 2011.

[32] S. Kalyani and R. M. Karthik, "The Asymptotic Distribution of Maxima of Independent and Identically Distributed Sums of Correlated or Non-Identical Gamma Random Variables and its Applications," *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 60, no. 9, pp. 2747–2758, 2012.

[33] J. Reig, "Performance of Maximal Ratio Combiners Over Correlated Nakagami-m Fading Channels with Arbitrary Fading Parameters," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 7, no. 5, pp. 1441–1444, 2008.

[34] G. Alexandropoulos, N. Sagias, F. Lazarakis, and K. Berberidis, "New Results for the Multivariate Nakagami-m Fading Model with Arbitrary Correlation Matrix and Applications," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 245–255, Jan 2009.

[35] H. Exton, *Multiple Hypergeometric Functions and Applications*, ser. Ellis Horwood series in mathematics and its applications. Ellis Horwood, 1976.

[36] H. M. Srivastava and P. W. Karlsson, *Multiple Gaussian Hypergeometric Series*, ser. Ellis Horwood series in mathematics and its applications: Statistics and operational research. Ellis Horwood, 1985.

[37] H. Exton, *Handbook of Hypergeometric Integrals: Theory, Applications, Tables, Computer Programs*, ser. Ellis Horwood series in mathematics and its applications. Ellis Horwood, 1978.

[38] A. M. Mathai and R. K. Saxena, *The H-function with Applications in Statistics and Other Disciplines*. Wiley, 1978.

[39] A. W. Marshall, I. Olkin, and B. Arnold, *Inequalities: Theory of Majorization and Its Applications*. Springer, 2011.

[40] S. P. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.

[41] C. Meyer, *Matrix Analysis and Applied Linear Algebra Book and Solutions Manual*. Siam, 2000, vol. 2.

[42] M. Shaked and J. Shanthikumar, *Stochastic Orders*, ser. Springer Series in Statistics. Physica-Verlag, 2007. [Online]. Available: http://books.google.co.in/books?id=rPiToBK2rwwC

[43] S.L. Lauritzen, "Exchangeable Rasch Matrices," *Rendiconti di Maternatica, Serie VII, 28, Roma, 83-95.*, 2008.

[44] R. Kaas, M. Goovaerts, J. Dhaene, and M. Denuit, *Modern Actuarial Risk Theory*. Springer, 2001, vol. 328.

[45] "Coordinated Multipoint Opreation for LTE Physical Layer Aspects (release 11) ," *3GPP TR 36.819 V11.0.0 (2011-09)*, 2011.

[46] D. Lewinski, "Nonstationary Probabilistic Target and Clutter Scattering Models," *IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation,*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 490–498, 1983.

[47] S. Al-Ahmadi and H. Yanikomeroglu, "On the Approximation of the Generalized K Distribution by a Gamma Distribution for Modeling Composite Fading Channels," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 706–713, 2010.

[48] ——, "On the Statistics of the Sum of Correlated Generalized-K RVs," in *2010 IEEE International Conference on Communications (ICC)*, 2010, pp. 1–5.

[49] V. Asghari, D. da Costa, and S. Aissa, "Symbol Error Probability of Rectangular QAM in MRC Systems With Correlated η-μ Fading Channels," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 1497–1503, March 2010.

[50] D. Tse and P. Viswanath, *Fundamentals of wireless communication*. Cambridge university press, 2005.